

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

ITV DIRECT, INC.,
Plaintiff,

v.

HEALTHY SOLUTIONS, LLC et al.,
Defendants.

CAPPSEALS, INC.,
Plaintiff-in-Intervention,

v.

HEALTHY SOLUTIONS, LLC, d/b/a
DIRECT BUSINESS CONCEPTS; ITV
DIRECT, INC.; and DIRECT
FULFILLMENT, LLC,
Intervenor-Defendants.

*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*

Civil Action No. 04-10421-JLT

MEMORANDUM

July 20, 2005

TAURO, J.

Between December 2003 and February 2004, Plaintiff ITV Direct, Inc. (“ITV”) received six shipments of a health supplement called “Supreme Greens” (hereinafter “goods”) from Defendant Healthy Solutions, LLC.¹ ITV accepted the goods, never claimed non-conformity, and never suggested that Healthy Solutions acted improperly in any way regarding the actual sale or delivery of the goods. The price of the goods totals \$1,821,864, and ITV has not paid the bill.²

¹See Joint Stipulations of Fact [#113] ¶ 34.

²Id. ¶¶ 6, 9, 12, 15, 18, 21, 34.

ITV refuses to pay for the goods because it alleges that Healthy Solutions breached the parties' distribution agreement by failing to pay ITV royalties from web site sales, failing to withdraw a trademark application, failing to assign the domain name "supremegreens.com" to ITV, and failing to indemnify ITV in a lawsuit brought against ITV by the Federal Trade Commission.³ Healthy Solutions denies these allegations and has brought a counterclaim against ITV for the price of the goods delivered and accepted.

Healthy Solutions, however, did not manufacture the goods. Rather, Healthy Solutions purchased the goods from Cappseals, Inc. Because ITV refuses to pay for the goods, Healthy Solutions has been unable to pay Cappseals. Seeking to ensure payment for the goods it manufactured, Cappseals intervened in this action and obtained a stipulated judgment against Healthy Solutions in the principal amount of \$890,182.09.⁴ Cappseals also brought a reach-and-apply claim against ITV. Cappseals has now moved for summary judgment with respect to its reach-and-apply claim.

For purposes of the instant motion for summary judgment, the issue to be decided is whether ITV's various claims against Healthy Solutions can set-off ITV's obligation to pay for the six shipments of goods manufactured by Cappseals and delivered by Healthy Solutions. If ITV cannot set-off its obligation to pay for the goods, then Cappseals would be entitled to

³See Am. Compl. ¶¶ 25, 31-32, 36-37, 38-42, 58-63. ITV also alleges that Healthy Solutions fraudulently induced ITV to enter into the Distribution Agreement by misrepresenting the reliability of scientific evidence supporting the health claims of Supreme Greens. See Am. Compl. ¶¶ 46-50. This, however, has not stopped ITV from selling the product. Joint Stipulations of Fact ¶¶ 30-31.

⁴J. Against Healthy Solutions, LLC [#91].

judgment as a matter of law on its statutory reach-and-apply claim.⁵

Discussion

Under Rule 56 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, summary judgment is appropriate only if the record reveals that there is “no genuine issue as to any material fact and . . . the moving party [has demonstrated an] entitle[ment] to a judgment as a matter of law.”⁶ Under this standard, the “party seeking summary judgment [must] make a preliminary showing that no genuine issue of material fact exists. Once the movant has made this showing, the nonmovant must contradict the showing by pointing to specific facts demonstrating that there is, indeed, a trialworthy issue.”⁷ In deciding whether to allow a motion for summary judgment, a court “‘must view the entire record in the light most hospitable to the party opposing summary judgment, indulging all reasonable inferences in that party’s favor.’”⁸

A. UCC § 2-717

The parties agree that Massachusetts law governs this dispute. Because this case involves

⁵More precisely, if Healthy Solutions is entitled to summary judgment on its counterclaim for the price of the goods, then both Healthy Solutions’ debt to Cappseals and ITV’s debt to Healthy Solutions would be reduced to judgments. The existence of both debts, established beyond dispute, would entitle Cappseals to summary judgment on its statutory reach-and-apply claim. See Hunter v. Youthstream Media Networks, Inc., 241 F. Supp. 2d 52, 57-58 (D. Mass. 2002) (citing Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 214 § 3(6), (7)).

⁶Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c).

⁷Blackie v. Maine, 75 F.3d 716, 721 (1st Cir. 1996) (quoting Nat’l Amusements, Inc. v. Town of Dedham, 43 F.3d 731, 735 (1st Cir. 1995)).

⁸Mullin v. Raytheon Co., 164 F.3d 696, 698 (1st Cir. 1999) (quoting Griggs-Ryan v. Smith, 904 F.2d 112, 115 (1st Cir. 1990)).

transactions in goods, the Massachusetts Uniform Commercial Code (“UCC”) controls.⁹ ITV argues that § 2-717 of the UCC allows ITV to withhold payment from Healthy Solutions, and ultimately Cappseals, because Healthy Solutions allegedly breached the parties’ distribution agreement. Under § 2-717, “[t]he buyer on notifying the seller of his intention so to do may deduct all or any part of the damages resulting from any breach of the contract from any part of the price still due under the same contract.”¹⁰ ITV construes UCC § 2-717 too broadly.

Section 2-717 “is not a general set-off provision permitting a buyer of goods to adjust its continuing contract obligations according to the equities perceived by the buyer.”¹¹ The buyer’s right to set-off under § 2-717 must “stem from a breach of the *same contract* under which the seller is attempting to recover his price.”¹² Moreover, “in order for a buyer to invoke § 2-717, the asserted breach must go to the *essence of the transaction* under which the seller seeks to recover his price.”¹³ For this reason, “it is well established that the buyer’s obligation to pay for goods tendered and accepted does not arise under the same contract as the alleged breach of an exclusive dealing or distributorship arrangement by the seller.”¹⁴

⁹Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 106, § 2-102.

¹⁰Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 106, § 2-717 displaces a buyer’s right to set-off under the common law. See Carlisle Corp. v. Uresco Const. Materials, Inc., 823 F. Supp. 271, 275 (M.D. Pa. 1993).

¹¹C. R. Bard, Inc. v. Med. Elecs. Corp., 529 F. Supp. 1382, 1387 (D. Mass. 1982) (quoting Columbia Gas Transmission Corp. v. Larry H. Wright, Inc., 443 F. Supp. 14, 20 (S.D. Ohio 1977)).

¹²Travenol Labs., Inc. v. Zotal, Ltd., 474 N.E.2d 1070, 1072 (Mass. 1985) (emphasis added).

¹³C. R. Bard, 529 F. Supp. at 1387 (emphasis added).

¹⁴Travenol Labs., 474 N.E.2d at 1073 (internal citations and quotations omitted).

In light of the applicable case law, ITV may not rely on § 2-717 to avoid its obligation to pay for the goods it accepted from Healthy Solutions. None of ITV's various claims against Healthy Solutions go to the essence of the purchase-and-sale transaction. It is undisputed that ITV re-sold, and continues to sell, the goods.¹⁵ It is also undisputed that ITV never rejected, or even complained about, any of the goods it accepted and re-sold.¹⁶ Like the situation in *C.R. Bard v. Medical Electronics Corp.*, "there is no hint that seller acted improperly in any way regarding the actual sale or delivery of the goods."¹⁷

Moreover, the purchase order at issue does not incorporate the parties' distributorship agreement.¹⁸ The purchase order, not the distributorship agreement, created ITV's obligation to pay for the specific goods purchased and accepted.¹⁹ While the distribution agreement certainly contemplated future sales, the individual purchase orders specifically set forth the price, type, quantity of goods, and method of cancellation.²⁰ ITV, therefore, may not set-off its obligation to pay for the goods with damages stemming from remote claims that do not involve the seller's duty to deliver conforming goods under the specific purchase order.²¹

¹⁵Joint Stipulations of Fact ¶¶ 30-31.

¹⁶See id. ¶¶ 22-31.

¹⁷529 F. Supp. at 1387.

¹⁸Silverman Aff. [#123] Ex. B ("Purchase Order No. 1101").

¹⁹See Carlisle Corp. v. Uresco Const. Materials, Inc., 823 F. Supp. 271, 274 (M.D. Pa. 1993).

²⁰See Purchase Order No. 1101.

²¹That the distribution agreement anticipated or even incorporated future purchase orders is irrelevant because the alleged breaches of the distribution agreement do not go to the essence of the particular purchase-and-sale transactions at issue.

B. Final Judgment

ITV argues that even if Cappseals is entitled to summary judgment, this court should not enter final judgment pursuant to Rule 54(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure until ITV's claims against Healthy Solutions have been adjudicated. This court disagrees. There is "no just reason" to further delay payment for goods delivered, accepted, and re-sold.²² Because ITV's claims against Healthy Solutions are separate and distinct from the specific purchase-and-sale transactions at issue, the Court of Appeals would not have to "decide the same issues more than once even if there were subsequent appeals."²³ Like other courts that have faced the issue, this court will not hesitate to enter final judgments pursuant to Rule 54(b) with respect to Healthy Solutions' counterclaim for the price of the goods and Cappseals' reach-and-apply claim.²⁴

AN ORDER WILL ISSUE.

/s/ Joseph L. Tauro
United States District Judge

²²Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b).

²³Carlisle Corp., 823 F. Supp. at 276 (internal citations omitted).

²⁴See id.; C. R. Bard, Inc. v. Med. Elecs. Corp., 529 F. Supp. 1382, 1388 (D. Mass. 1982).

Publisher Information

**Note* This page is not part of the opinion as entered by the court.
The docket information provided on this page is for the benefit
of publishers of these opinions.**

Peter S. Brooks
Seyfarth Shaw, LLP
Two Seaport Lane, Ste. 300
Boston, MA 02210-2028
617-946-4991

617-946-4801 (fax)
pbrooks@seyfarth.com
Assigned: 04/09/2004

LEAD ATTORNEY

ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED representing ITV Direct, Inc.
(Plaintiff) Direct Fulfillment, LLC
(Intervenor Defendant) ITV Direct, Inc.
(Intervenor Defendant) Kristin Cataldo
Gadsby & Hannah LLP
225 Franklin street
Boston, MA 02110
617-345-7046

617-204-8046 (fax)
Kcataldo@ghlaw.com
Assigned: 07/07/2004

ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED representing Cappseals, Inc.
(Intervenor Plaintiff) Becky V. Christensen
O'Connor Christensen & McLaughlin LLP
1920 Main Street

Suite 150
Irvine, CA 92614
949-851-5000
949-851-5051 (fax)
bvc@ocmplaw.com
Assigned: 07/20/2004

LEAD ATTORNEY

ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED representing Health Solutions, Inc.
(Consolidated Plaintiff) Health Solutions, Inc.
(Defendant) Healthy Solutions, L.L.C.
(Intervenor Defendant) Healthy Solutions, LLC
(Consolidated Plaintiff) Healthy Solutions, LLC
(Defendant) Alejandro Guerrero
(Consolidated Plaintiff) Alejandro Guerrero
(Defendant) Greg Geremesz
(Defendant) Michael Howell
(Defendant) Susan W. Gelwick

Seyfarth Shaw, LLP
World Trade Center East
Two Seaport Lane
Boston, MA 02210-2028
617-946-4800

617-946-4801 (fax)
sgelwick@seyfarth.com
Assigned: 07/14/2004
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED representing Direct Fulfillment, LLC
(Counter Defendant) Direct Fulfillment, LLC
(Intervenor Defendant) ITV Direct, Inc.
(Counter Defendant) ITV Direct, Inc.
(Intervenor Defendant) ITV Direct, Inc.
(Plaintiff) Dustin F. Hecker
Posternak, Blankstein & Lund
Prudential Tower
800 Boylston Street
Boston, MA 02199-8004
617-973-6100
617-722-4927 (fax)
dhecker@pbl.com
Assigned: 04/21/2004
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED representing Health Solutions, Inc.
(Defendant) Healthy Solutions, LLC
(Defendant) Alejandro Guerrero
(Defendant) Greg Geremesz
(Defendant) Michael Howell
(Defendant) Daniel J. Kelly
Gadsby & Hannah LLP
225 Franklin street
Boston, MA 02110
617-345-7026
617-204-8026 (fax)
dkelly@ghlaw.com
Assigned: 04/08/2004
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED representing Cappseals, Inc.
(Intervenor Plaintiff) Christopher C. Larkin
Seyfarth Shaw
Suite 3300
2029 Century Park E
Los Angeles, CA 90067-3063
310-277-7200
Assigned: 07/20/2004
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED representing ITV Direct, Inc.
(Consolidated Defendant) William E. Levin
Levin & Hawes
384 Forest Avenue
Suite 13
Laguna Beach, CA 92651
949-497-7676
Assigned: 07/20/2004
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED representing Health Solutions, Inc.
(Consolidated Plaintiff) Healthy Solutions, LLC
(Consolidated Plaintiff) Alejandro Guerrero

(Consolidated Plaintiff) Craig McLaughlin
O'Connor Christensen & McLaughlin LLP
1920 Main Street
Suite 150

Irvine, CA 92614

949-851-5000

949-851-5051 (fax)

cml@ocmplaw.com

Assigned: 07/20/2004

LEAD ATTORNEY

ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED representing Health Solutions, Inc.

(Consolidated Plaintiff) Health Solutions, Inc.

(Defendant) Healthy Solutions, LLC

(Consolidated Plaintiff) Healthy Solutions, LLC

(Defendant) Alejandro Guerrero

(Consolidated Plaintiff) Alejandro Guerrero

(Defendant) Greg Geremesz

(Defendant) Michael Howell

(Defendant) Christian H. Pedersen

Metaxas Norman, & Pidgeon LLP

900 Cummings Center

Suite 207T

Beverly, MA 01915

978-927-8000

978-922-6464 (fax)

cpedersen@mnplaw.com

Assigned: 03/02/2004

TERMINATED: 07/01/2004

LEAD ATTORNEY

ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED representing ITV Direct, Inc.

(Plaintiff) Katherine E. Perrelli

Seyfarth Shaw

World Trade Center East

Two Seaport Lane

Suite 300

Boston, MA 02210-2028

617-946-4817

617-946-4801 (fax)

kperrelli@seyfarth.com

Assigned: 04/09/2004

TERMINATED: 07/14/2004

LEAD ATTORNEY

ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED representing ITV Direct, Inc.

(Plaintiff) Christopher F. Robertson

Seyfarth Shaw, LLP

World Trade Center East

Two Seaport Lane

Suite 300

Boston, MA 02210

617-946-4800

crobertson@seyfarth.com

Assigned: 04/09/2004

LEAD ATTORNEY

ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED representing ITV Direct, Inc.

(Plaintiff) ITV Direct, Inc.

(Counter Defendant) ITV Direct, Inc.

(Intervenor Defendant) ITV Direct, Inc.

(Consolidated Defendant) Scott A. Silverman

Gadsby & Hannah LLP

225 Franklin street

Boston, MA 02110

617-345-7077

617-204-8077 (fax)

ssilverman@ghlaw.com

Assigned: 02/03/2005

ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED representing Cappseals, Inc.

(Intervenor Plaintiff) John Andrew Singer

Federal Trade Commission

600 Pennsylvania Ave, NW

Washington, DC 20580

202-326-3234

202-326-2477 (fax)

jsinger@ftc.gov

Assigned: 05/19/2005

LEAD ATTORNEY

ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED representing Federal Trade Commission

(Objector)